



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*Sir*: I ask a little space for reply to some of the criticisms in a review of my translation of "Beowulf" contained in No. 13 of your Journal. For the generally favorable opinion expressed and for some of the bibliographical references I am much obliged, but, without going into details, I may say that I do not think it necessary to include in the bibliography of a work every book that in any way makes reference to it. As to the difficulties of Anglo-Saxon inversion for the general reader, they are sufficiently commented on in my preface, and as to the *Unwörter* charged, none are specified, and I do not think that any words used would be unintelligible to the general reader except the dozen or so for which a glossary is given.

The reviewer would seem to require that a line-for-line translation, which tries to preserve two accents to the half-line, should follow the principle of the Revisers of 1611 rather than that of the Revisers of 1881, as he objects to "the perpetual recurrence of such words as 'victorious,' 'jewel,' 'treasure,'" and thinks "a subtler insight would have perceived picturesque shades of meaning." When it is recollected that of *sige* and *sigor* = "victory," there are over a dozen compounds, of *sinc* = "jewel" or "treasure," at least six, of *māðum* = "jewel" no less than fourteen, and of *hord* = "treasure," about twelve, besides the "perpetual recurrence" of these words by themselves, I think the "subtler insight" would have been overburdened, and it were better to decline the attempt to find "picturesque shades of meaning."

I cannot notice each one of the *thirty-five* references in which, for one reason or another, exception is taken, and in some of which I concede that the correction is more exact than the word or phrase used; but many of them touch very small points, often silently passed over in Heyne's translation (which, being in ten-syllable iambic measure, is much freer), some are due to the failure to use Grein's text, the one translated, in the comparison instead of Heyne's, and others are inadmissible.

Some examples of each of these will be given: (1) Exception is taken to the omission of the particle *hāru* in 182 and 369. This important word = saltem, quidem, certe, γέ, and is omitted entirely by Heyne in both passages. I find that I have translated it "now," "indeed," in *seven* other passages, but while my translation professes to be line-for-line, it does not profess to be word-for-word, and I should not have considered it much of a blemish if I had omitted it in all of them. In one of these, 862, where I have "now," the reviewer corrects to "nevertheless," Heyne's glossary giving *doch*, *jedoch* for this reference. Let us substitute it and read the line:

"They did not *nevertheless* at all their dear lord blame" (!)

Surely some license in particles may be allowed to even a line-for-line translator.

Again, as to the "neglect . . . of the duals" in 1707 and 1783. I forbear to quote the lines, but would simply ask, is it necessary to inform the general reader that the original has *wit* = "we two" in the one, and *unc* = "us two" in the other, of these "important passages," where two persons are conversing? Also, in 1861 *ganot* certainly = "gannet." The word is omitted in Grein's glossary, and given by Heyne as "Taucher, fulica marina" in glossary, and his translation has "über des Tauchers Bad." Now *fulica* = coot (Andrews), and "gannet" = "the Solan goose" (Webster),—whatever aquatic fowl that may be—so that I should have had authority for "coot," or "goose," or simply "diver" instead of "swan," but my sole attempt at "picturesqueness" has come to grief. Moreover, under *ganet*, Toller-Bosworth gives "*swan*, cygnus," as one of the meanings. It is, perhaps, needless to remark that the translation is not designed to teach ornithological distinctions, or the existence of a dual in Anglo-Saxon, or extreme accuracy in the use of particles under all circumstances. There are more of the same sort, but these examples must suffice.

(2) A more serious charge is that "LL. 2522-23 and 3117 take a liberty with the text." The reviewer should have examined Grein's text, or even Heyne's *third* edition, before making this charge. Grein reads *oreðes and áttres*, 2523, which I have translated; Heyne, *rêðes and-háttres* (Holder prints *rêðes and hat-tres*, using the common symbol for *and*), and his *third* edition gives a full note on the passage, which is omitted in his *fourth* edition. I have inadvertently omitted to give a note here, but I think this is the only passage where the *texts* vary and the note is omitted out of more than one hundred and fifty such variations. There are a few other passages noted below where the words of the text are the same, but the explanations of the editors are different, and I have omitted to give notes on these passages. In 3117 the reviewer has, doubtless, been misled by Heyne's rendering of *strengum*, "violenter, mit Macht," under *strengo*, whereas Heyne himself gives the correct translation, "von den Sehnen," under *gebêðan*. A glance at Toller-Bosworth, s. v. *gebêðan*, would have helped here. In the four passages following, if the reviewer had examined Grein's glossary, the suggested corrections would have been unnecessary: in 1616 Heyne has *broden mæl*, and in glossary "das gezogene Schwert," "die gezückte Waffe," but in translation "die hartgeschmiedete"; Grein has *brodenmæl* = "mit geschwungenen gewundenen Zeichen versehenes, damascirtes Schwert, vgl. *wundenmæl*," hence "damaskeened" would have been exact, if rhythm had permitted; "twisted" is too free, and "etched" should have been used, as for *wundenmæl* in 1531, but not "drawn," according to Grein.

Again, in 2029 Grein takes *selda* = "Höfing," and *selda* here as acc. pl. (I use "courtier" generically), not as adverb with Heyne; also *leodhryre*, 2030 and 2391, = "Fall der Leute," not, as Heyne, "Fall des Fürsten," but I have a note on this word. This is one of the most difficult passages in "Beowulf" criticism and cannot be settled dogmatically. Thorpe, who suggests *pléh* for *oft*, says: "Ignorance of the events and the defective state of the MS render interpretation little else than guesswork," but the MS shows no lacuna here (cf. Holder, p. 46, 174b, l. 9), and there is no authority for Heyne's insertion of *nô*.<sup>1</sup> The reviewer says: "In our opinion *oft* here belongs to *gesette*." This will

<sup>1</sup> Wülcker, however, in his new edition of Grein's Bibliothek, thinks *nô* might have stood in the MS and so reads in his restored text, but Holder shows no trace of such omission.

not answer. How could Hrothgar, by betrothing his daughter Fréaware to Ingeld, Froda's son, *often* appease quarrels? Also, under *bāgan* Grein gives here "sich zu einem wenden, ihn ereilen," referring to the spear as subject, and not "er ruht," as Heyne. But enough for one passage. In 2576 for *gryre-fáhne* Grein gives "grauenvoll feindlich," and I have rendered it simply "fearful foe"; Heyne gives "grauenvoll glänzend," and the reviewer has turned it into the "picturesque" "grisly-hued," a blending of Thorpe's "grisly variegated" and Arnold's "terrible many-hued." Toller-Bosworth has "terribly hostile, or terrible in its variegated coloring," with this as the only reference; the reader can take his choice. In 2640, *onmunde úsíc mærcða*, Grein takes *onmunan* = "einen womit bedenken," "einem etwas zudenken"; Heyne gives "ermahnte uns zu Ruhmesthaten," which the reviewer has literally translated, correcting my adoption of Grein's explanation, as I was translating Grein's text. Although there is no variation of text in these four passages, I might have added notes giving Heyne's explanation also, but the omission to do so does not excuse the reviewer's neglect to note Grein's explanations. There are two other references, 1793 and 1980, which I must pass by.

(3) Among inadmissible renderings the following may be noted: in 498 for *duguð*, which I have translated "band," the reviewer gives "joy," and refers to "Toller-Bosworth, 218, for numerous references, though this one is omitted," and well it might be, for there is no ground whatever for translating *duguð*, "joy" (the meaning of *dréam* in 497), nor is any such meaning given in T.-B. 218. The word "joy" does not occur in the renderings. The nearest approach to it is under IV. "prosperity, riches, blessings," "prosperitas, divitiæ, opes," and among the "numerous references" the only example containing the word "joys" is as follows: *Eallum biddæled duguþum and dredmum*, "deprived of all blessings and joys," where *dredmum* = "joys," and *duguþum*, "blessings," a meaning totally out of place in "Beowulf," 498, where Danes and Weders are having a grand carouse. If we look to authorities, the result is the same: both Grein and Heyne give "Kriegerschaar, Gefolge, vorzüglich edle Kriegerschaar," citing this passage, and the latter under *unlytel*, "eine sehr grosse Ritterschaar." Thorpe translates *duguð unlytel*, "no few nobles," and Arnold "a great gathering of noble knights." But it is useless to heap up authorities; "joy" will not answer, nor does T.-B. give any support to it.

So 1191, *be þæm gebrōðrum twæm*, the reviewer gives "'twixt" for "by." For *be* Grein and Heyne give "bei, an, neben," quoting this passage; T.-B., "by, near to, etc., juxta, prope, etc."; Thorpe, "by the two brethren"; Arnold, "beside the two brethren." For the view that Beowulf sat "twixt the two brethren," there is no ground but in the reviewer's imagination.

In 1943 "leman" certainly = *leofne mannan*, etymologically, and the writer of "King Horn" might well have put it here, but however worthy its older associations, "subtler insight" might have suggested an avoidance of it in modern English (cf. Webster, s. v.). Thorpe gives "a dear man"; Arnold, "her dear husband."<sup>1</sup>

In 2577 the reviewer again touches a *crux*, but disposes of it very summarily.

<sup>1</sup> For the "bad sense" of "leman" already in Chaucer's time, see Manciple's Tale, r8086 (Gilman), *et seqq.*:

"Hir lemmān? certes this is a knavyssh speche!"

This is the only passage in which I follow Heyne's explanation in text and relegate Grein's to the notes. Heyne has in glossary "*incge lāfe*, mit dem kostbaren Schwerte? oder mit wuchtigem Schwerte?" and in his translation "mit dem wuchtigen Stahl," hence "weighty" would have been better than "mighty." Grein follows Thorpe in taking *incge* as a proper name = Ing, King of the Danes, but then we must read *Incge*[s] with Thorpe, who says: "My interpretation is quite conjectural, the word *incge* being unknown to me," and he translates "with Inge's relic." Arnold, too, follows Thorpe, translating "with the Dane's (?) bequest," but says: "No one has suggested an explanation for *incge*." The reviewer suggests "with the *edge* of the sword," to which translation there would be no objection *if* there was any authority for the reading, but the scribe uses *ecge* in the same line and might easily have written *ecge* here, if that were the reading, and Holder gives plainly *inc ge lafe* (p. 59, 187a, l. 11), so that *ecge* must be rejected, and *incge* still awaits a satisfactory explanation. T.-B. has not yet reached the word. Heyne suggests a connection with *icge gold*, 1107, = "Schatzgold, reiches Gold?" but that word is equally as unknown. Wackerbarth translates "And with his mighty Relic Brand." Ettmüller follows Thorpe and Grein.<sup>1</sup>

To shorten this reply, I notice lastly only 2820, *dōm* = "doom," which translation might be "ambiguous" if the context did not show plainly what was meant, but it is certainly literal. It means here, of course, "heavenly glory," "Herlichkeit" (Grein and Heyne), "doom of the just" (Thorpe), "doom of the soothfast" (Arnold), but it does *not* mean "realm," nor will any support for this rendering be found in T.-B., q. v., s. v. III, p. 207, where "numerous references" for *dōm* = "glory" may be found.

I am obliged for some of the references, as they will enable me to supply further notes, but I am glad that the philological microscope, even when of strong magnifying power, has been able to detect so few "inaccuracies."

JAMES M. GARNETT.

<sup>1</sup> If the lists are still open, I would suggest *sinc-gelāfe* (cf. *māððum-sweord*, 1023), alliterating with *sio*, which alliteration, although rare, is still admissible; *s* at beginning of the MS line might have been dropped as readily as after *ge* within the line. The facsimile of the Beowulf MS., just published by the Early English Text Society, reads *incgelāfe*, apparently as one word. Thorkelin printed *Inc gelāfe*, but misinterpreted the passage; Grundtvig, *incgelāfe*, but suggests *Ingwina lāfe*? Kemble says in glossary, s. v. *lāf*, "*incge-lāf*, ensis. I cannot explain the first word, and believe it to be a corruption of *icge-lāf*," and he gives "*icge* ? *veg-etus*, *magnus*, *eximius*," with 1107 as the sole reference. The conjecture has, at least, the merit of being perfectly intelligible.